

THE LOUISVILLE DAILY JOURNAL.

VOLUME XXXVIII.

LOUISVILLE JOURNAL.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE
LOUISVILLE JOURNAL CO.
Green street, between Third and Fourth.

JOHN D. PRESTICE, Editor.
JOHN L. KIRBY, Chief Local.

Democratic Nominations.

JULY ELECTION.

FOR GOVERNOR.
JOHN W. STEVENSON.

FOR JUDGE OF THE COURT OF COMMON
PLEAS.
HENRY J. STEELE.

FOR CHANCELLOR.
THOMAS H. COCHRAN.

FOR MEMBER OF THE CHANCERY COURT.
W. C. WELCHMAN.

THE CHIEF OF THE CHANCERY COURT.
THOMAS W. THOMAS.

FOR JUDGE OF THE CIRCUIT COURT.
JOHN S. CAIN.

FOR MEMBER OF THE CIRCUIT COURT.
JOHN M. McNAUL.

THE CITY AND COUNTY ATTORNEY.
E. HAGAN.

THE MARCHAL OF THE CITY COURT.
WILL HOWARD.

FRIDAY, APRIL 10, 1863.

IN the court of impeachment yesterday, Mr. Clegg began his opening speech, which will be concluded to-day. A synopsis of the speech, so far as delivered, will be found in our telegraphic column. The speech is evidently one of surpassing ability.

WE ARE A PRESIDING MENT WITH IMPEACHMENT TO EXECUTE A LAW IN CONGRESS.—Concerning this point Butler in his opening speech says,

It is indeed, the law duly passed by Congress, affecting generally the welfare of any considerable portion of the people, has been composed, as a mere document, a mere specimen of law, and, therefore, ineffectual, and therefore ineffectual, there might seem to be some palliation if not justification to the Executive to refuse to execute a law in order to have its constitutionality tested by the court.

How stands the fact? Has the Supreme Court so frequently declared the laws of Congress unconstitutional, that he has vetoed it for that reason, would, in effect, be far from executing his veto and leave the law unexecuted?

It may be said he may do this at his pleasure. True, but the point is, he is impeached for violating his oath of office, as is now being done.—*Butler's* opening speech

That may be his *per se* *order* *of* *refusal*, but not under the sway of the Constitution.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*? The frequency with which the court has declared other laws unconstitutional, since he has vetoed it for that reason, would, in effect, be far from executing his veto and leave the law unexecuted.

It may be said he may do this at his pleasure. True, but the point is, he is impeached for violating his oath of office, as is now being done.—*Butler's* opening speech

That may be his *per se* *order* *of* *refusal*, but not under the sway of the Constitution.

According to the Constitution, his only peril is the peril of having to execute the law, if it should be pronounced unconstitutional. Until then, he is in no peril, and then, he is in no further peril than the *just* *ground* *for* *belief*.

To impeach him before the adjournment of the case is to impeach him for violating a law without his knowledge, whoop's speech was uttered by the *Senate*.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd. If the court has not declared other laws unconstitutional, but that a given law is unconstitutional, then the *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

If the court has not declared other laws unconstitutional, but that a given law is unconstitutional, then the *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground* *for* *belief*?

The *Senate* has the action of the court in rejecting other laws to do with its act respecting a given law? Very little, if anything. Nothing worth considering. The idea of Butler is in fact absurd.

Now what is *just* *ground</i*

